UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-PS-O-

RASHAD DRISCOLL, SR.,

Plaintiff,

-V-

DECISION AND ORDER 13-CV-0336M

OFFICER JOSEPH RUDNICK, et al.,

Defendants.

On August 28, 2014, the Court issued an Order that, *inter alia*, dismissed the pro se Amended Complaint against Defendants James T. Hayden and Weeden A. Wetmore, see 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and 1915A, and directed the Clerk of the Court to serve the Summons and Amended Complaint upon the remaining Defendants, Officer Joseph Rudnick and Trooper Fifield. (Dkt. # 8.) Summonses were issued and the Marshals Service attempted to serve Rudnick and Fifield by mail pursuant to N.Y.C.P.L.R. § 312-a. Fifield filed an answer (Dkt. # 10), but the Marshals Service's Process Receipt and Return of Service Form was returned with a notation that Rudnick no longer worked at the Elmira Police Department, which is the address noted on the Summons for Rudnick and where service by mail was attempted (Dkt. # 9).

Once a *pro se* plaintiff is granted permission to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the responsibility for effecting service of the summons and complaint shifts from the plaintiff to the court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d); *Wright v. Lewis*, 76 F.3d 57, 59 (2d Cir. 1996). "Such a plaintiff is thus 'relieved by his poverty of the responsibility for filing and effecting service of his complaint," and has "thus relinquished control over service." *Soto v. Keenan*, 409 F. Supp. 2d 215, 218 (W.D.N.Y. 2006)

Case 1:13-cv-00336-WMS-MJR Document 11 Filed 10/14/14 Page 2 of 2

(quoting Wright, 76 F.3d at 59). The Court, therefore, requests that the Corporation Counsel of the

City of Elmira ascertain a proper address for service upon Rudnick pursuant to Valentin v. Dinkins,

121 F.3d 72 (2d. Cir. 1997) (per curiam). The Corporation Counsel need not undertake to defend

or indemnify Rudnick at this juncture. This Order merely provides a means by which Plaintiff may

name and properly serve the Defendant as instructed by the Second Circuit in Valentin.

The Corporation Counsel of the City of Elmira is hereby requested to produce the

information specified above to the Court's Pro Se Office by November 14, 2014. If the information

includes a personal residence address, the information can be provided to the Court in camera. Once

this information is provided, amended summonses shall be issued and the Court shall direct service

on Rudnick. The Clerk of the Court shall send a copy of this Order and the Amended Complaint to

the Corporation Counsel for the City of Elmira, City Hall, 317 East Church Street, Elmira, New York

14901.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 10, 2014

Rochester, New York

HON FRANK P. GERACI, JR.

United States District Judge

2